

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-6 and 10, as amended, remain herein. Claims 1 and 3-6 have been amended. New claim 10 has been added. Support for the amendments and the new claim may be found throughout the specification (see, e.g., original claim 2, page 39, line 21 to page 40, line 7; and page 36, lines 1-16<sup>1</sup> of the specification).

Applicants confirm that on June 25, 2008 the Examiner called to notify applicants that the PTO-892 mailed June 18, 2008 failed to include the reference to Fukuyama US Patent Application Publication 2001/0005021.

1. Claims 1, 2 and 7-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Kohama JP 2000-243574.

Applicants' claim 1 recites an organic electroluminescent device comprising an electron injecting layer and an electron-injection-suppressing layer arranged between the cathode and the emitting layer, the electron mobility of the electron-injection-suppressing layer being smaller than the electron mobility of the electron injecting layer, and the electron mobility of the electron injecting layer being greater than the electron mobility of (8-quinolinolato)aluminum complex.

Kohama does not disclose applicants' claimed electron injecting layer and electron-injection-suppressing layer. Kohama says nothing about an electron injecting layer and an electron-injection-suppressing layer wherein the electron mobility of the electron-injection-

---

<sup>1</sup> Alq is disclosed as an example of material for the electron-injection-suppressing layer. Thus, because the electron mobility of the electron injecting layer is greater than the electron mobility of the electron-injection-suppressing layer, there is support for the electron mobility of the electron injecting layer being greater than that of Alq.

suppressing layer is smaller than the electron mobility of the electron injecting layer, and the electron mobility of the electron injecting layer is greater than the electron mobility of (8-quinolinolato)aluminum complex.

Thus, Kohama does not disclose all elements of applicants' claims and, therefore, it is not an adequate basis for rejection of applicants' claims under § 102(b). Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

2. Claims 1, 2 and 7-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Fukuyama et al. US Patent Application Publication 2001/0005021.

Applicants' claim 1 recites an organic electroluminescent device comprising an electron injecting layer and an electron-injection-suppressing layer arranged between the cathode and the emitting layer, the electron mobility of the electron-injection-suppressing layer being smaller than the electron mobility of the electron injecting layer, and the electron mobility of the electron injecting layer being greater than the electron mobility of (8-quinolinolato)aluminum complex.

Fukuyama does not disclose applicants' claimed electron injecting layer. Fukuyama uses Alq as the electron injecting material (see Fukuyama at paragraph [0039]), while applicants' claim 1 requires an electron injecting layer having an electron mobility greater than the electron mobility of (8-quinolinolato)aluminum complex.

Thus, Fukuyama does not disclose all elements of applicants' claims and, therefore, it is not an adequate basis for rejection of applicants' claims under § 102(b). Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

3. Claims 1-3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Hara et al. JP 08-222373.

Applicants' claim 1 recites an organic electroluminescent device comprising an electron injecting layer and an electron-injection-suppressing layer between the cathode and the emitting layer, the electron mobility of the electron-injection-suppressing layer being smaller than the electron mobility of the electron injecting layer, and the electron mobility of the electron injecting layer being greater than the electron mobility of (8-quinolinolato)aluminum complex.

Hara does not disclose applicants' claimed electron injecting layer and electron-injection-suppressing layer. Contrary to the assertion in the Office Action, layers 2a and 2b are not an electron injecting layer and an electron-injection-suppressing layer but hole transport layers between the anode and the emitting layer (see Hara at Abstract). In addition, Hara says nothing about an electron injecting layer and an electron-injection-suppressing layer wherein the electron mobility of the electron-injection-suppressing layer is smaller than the electron mobility of the electron injecting layer, and the electron mobility of the electron-injection-suppressing layer is greater than the electron mobility of (8-quinolinolato)aluminum complex.

Thus, Hara does not disclose all elements of applicants' claims and, therefore, it is not an adequate basis for rejection of applicants' claims under § 102(b). Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

4. Claims 4-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Fukuyama in view of Kawamura JP 2000-186094.

As discussed above, Fukuyama does not teach or suggest applicants' electron injecting layer having an electron mobility greater than the electron mobility of (8-quinolinolato)aluminum

complex.

Kawamura does not teach or suggest what is missing from Fukuyama. Kawamura says nothing about applicants' claimed electron injecting layer and electron-injection-suppressing layer, wherein the electron mobility of the electron-injection-suppressing layer is smaller than the electron mobility of the electron injecting layer, and the electron mobility of the electron injecting layer is greater than the electron mobility of (8-quinolinolato)aluminum complex.

Thus, none of Fukuyama and Kawamura discloses all elements of applicants' claims, and none of these references discloses anything that would have suggested applicants' claimed invention to one of ordinary skill in the art. Further, there is no disclosure or teaching in any of Fukuyama, Kawamura, or otherwise in this record that would have suggested the desirability of combining any portions thereof effectively to anticipate or suggest applicants' presently claimed invention. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Serial No. 10/559,433  
ATTY. DKT. 28955.1066

For all the foregoing reasons, all claims 1, 3-6 and 10 are now proper in form and patentably distinguished over all grounds of rejection cited in the Office Action. The PTO is hereby authorized to charge or credit any necessary fees to Deposit Account No. 19-4293. Should the Examiner deem that any further amendments would be desirable in placing this application in even better condition for issue, he is invited to telephone applicants' undersigned representative.

Respectfully submitted,

STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP

Date: October 20, 2008

Houda MORAD

Roger W. Parkhurst  
Reg. No. 25,177  
Houda Morad  
Reg. No. 56,742

STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP  
1330 Connecticut Ave., N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
Tel: (202) 429-3000  
Fax: (202) 429-3902